

this face of the inscription being sharply scored round with a single deeply cut line. I understand that the date thus given, A. H. 702 (A. D. 1303) is historically doubtful, but the point is discussed in Mr. Blagden's paper.

- B. Line 3. (a)mbil. A close examination of the stone seems to reveal traces of the final *i*. I would conjecture the preceding word to be *jika ia*, which has an echo in line 6. This leaves a lacuna of probably not more than two words.
- B. Line 7. *sa-titah* "it is the command" (cf. A. 1.7). I prefer this to the alternative *sa-bantah*.
- B. Line 12. *inkar balachara hembalang*. The second word is an almost certain restoration, as the stone shews traces of the upper parts of three tall letters (alif) with precisely the same spacing as in 1. 7, and I can see no alternative to *inkar*; in which case, however, the meaning would appear nonsensical, "if they deny the offence (they shall yet be) stoned!"
- C. Line 1. *sa-puloh tengah tiga*. I incline to this, with the word *tahil* understood, rather than the alternative $10\frac{1}{2}$ *saga*. If, as there is reason to believe, a *saga* is one-twentieth part of a *tahil* the fine imposed on the child of a reigning prince is light indeed compared with fines of $7\frac{1}{2}$ or 5 *tahils* for those of lower rank.

In these brief notes I have purposely dealt with nothing beyond the obvious and superficial points which have presented themselves on what is, I believe, the first serious attempt to master the contents of this inscription. The intrinsic details of the historical and philological side of the record are beyond the scope of the present writer.

In conclusion I wish to express my thanks to all who have assisted me in the preparation of this article and in particular to Mr. C. O. Blagden, who besides allowing me to use his translation, gave me in addition the privilege of his advice and comments of which I have not hesitated to avail myself.

A Note on the Trengganu Inscription.

By C. O. BLAGDEN.

The most important point about this interesting record is the date at which the enactments of Islamic Law that it contains are recorded by it to have been promulgated. That much is obvious, for the wording of the record indicates that the promulgation was an act of state and that at that time the Muhammadan religion had become the "established church" of Trengganu. Whatever the precise date may be, it is at any

rate earlier than any hitherto recorded establishment of Islam as a state religion in the Malay Peninsula. But of course one would like something more definite than that.

Most unfortunately the first face of the stone ends with the words *di-tahun Saratan di-sasanakala Baginda Rasul Allah telah lalu tujuh ratus dua*. Now to me it seems that this is necessarily an incomplete statement, and that in order to complete it there must have been on the next face the word *tahun*, "years." Taking the words *telah lalu* literally one is tempted to interpret them in the sense that the number of years stated had actually completely elapsed at the time referred to (when the edict was promulgated). I do not, however, interpret them in that way. The years of the Islamic Calendar, like our own years, are commonly reckoned as current years. In the case of Indian inscriptions (Hindu or Buddhist) the reckoning is very generally (but not always) expressed in expired years, i.e. the number of years actually completed since the initial point of the particular era used, this being then followed by a statement of the month (lunar or solar) and day, and very often by various other details of astronomical and astrological import. I am disposed to think that the use here of an expression which, if literally interpreted, implies the mention of expired years was merely due to a traditional habit and that the Muhammadan year given is, in spite of the formula employed, to be taken as the year current at the moment. But even so the Malay phrase, as such, seems to me to be incomplete without the word *tahun* after it.

If, however, the statement of the date ran over onto the next face, the upper part of which is unfortunately lost, various possibilities arise. The *dua* may then have been not the mere integer "two" but a part of either (i) *dua-lapan*, the old well-attested form now reduced to *dêlapan* or *lapan*, "eight", or (ii) *dua-puloh*, "twenty." Either of these could have completed the number of the years, and either could have been further followed by other numbers. Consequently there may have been two more alternatives, these being groups of years, viz. (iii) *dua-puloh* followed by any integer from *satu*, "one" to *sambilan*, "nine", and (iv) *dualapan-puloh*, either by itself or followed by any integer, as before. Thus the range of possible alternative years is enlarged to the series 702, 708, 720-729, and 780-789, if we regard merely the year number. However with the given month (Rajab) the alternatives as expressed in our reckoning come down to these: (1) the lunar month beginning 19 February 1303, (2) the lunar month beginning 15 December 1307, (3) one of the months of Rajab comprised in the period beginning 7 August 1320 and ending 30 May 1329, and (4) one of the Rajabs of the period beginning 24 October 1378 and ending 16 August 1387.

The record further defines the given year as a year of Cancer (*Saratân*), and the question arises "what does this mean?" In

every year the Sun appears to us to pass in turn through each of the twelve Zodiacal signs, of which Cancer is the fourth. How, therefore, can any particular year be identified with an individual sign? It can hardly mean that the Sun was in Cancer when the year began, for such a system, of which I have never heard, would if applied to Muhammadan lunar years cause two (or more) successive years to be called after the same sign, inasmuch as the Muhammadan year shifts its beginning back 11 days each year (with an extra margin for leap-years), but the Sun stays a month or so in each sign. If there ever was such a system, the year A. H. 702 would not under it have been a Cancer year, for that year began on 26 August 1302 and the Sun had passed out of Cancer about a month previously. Nor would any single year comprised in the alternatives given above satisfy the condition: they all begin at wrong times, as anyone can see by referring to a Muhammadan Calendar. That conceivable explanation, therefore, must be dismissed.

To my mind the only reasonable explanation seems to involve the existence at that period of some 12-year cycle of year-names following the names of the Zodiacal signs. Of such a system in connection with the Muhammadan Calendar I have never heard; but the Hindus had one, and it seems probable that we have here again a relic of Indian tradition. This Hindu cycle was based on the revolution round the Sun of the planet Jupiter, which takes a little less than twelve of our years, the planet during that period passing through each of the twelve signs and being nearly a year in each. Now the Hindu solar year, which was used for the purpose of this computation, began when the Sun entered the Indian sign corresponding with our Aries, and whatever sign Jupiter happened to be in at that moment, the year then beginning received the name of that sign. Assuming that the writer of the Trengganu record was following a traditional system inherited from Hindu times, there remains the further question whether that system was still understood (by those who used it) to be in relation to the movements of Jupiter, or whether it had degenerated into a merely mechanical naming of the years in succession by names which had ceased to have any relation to astronomical facts. To me the latter alternative seems the less probable one in view of the curious circumstance that we have the name Cancer given in Arabic, not in any traditional Indian form. It looks as if the persons who used it knew that it had an astronomical reference, at any rate. If we are forced to the conclusion that the name had become a merely arbitrary one, there is no point in paying any further attention to it, for it can give no clue to the year intended. This is due to the circumstance that at intervals of 85 or 86 years a sign-name would properly have had to be suppressed because of the fact that in that period Jupiter, owing to his time of staying in any one sign being some days less than the length of our year, gets a whole year behind. As we have no means of knowing when the change to a merely

mechanical repetition occurred, if in fact it did occur, there is therefore no possibility of identifying the year by its sign-name.

Supposing, however, that the system was still understood to be in relation with the movements of the planet, how was it worked after the introduction of the Muhammadan Calendar? If the Hindu practice was still followed, the year being named in accordance with the sign in which Jupiter stood at the entrance of the Sun into the Indian representative of Aries, then A. H. 702 becomes impossible, and the same is true of A. H. 708. Neither of the Indian years, beginning on the 25th March, 1302 and 1308, in which these Muhammadan years begin, is a Cancer year under the Indian system. On the other hand, 1327 and 1386 are Cancer years, and it is conceivable that A. H. 728 (which began 17 November 1327) and A. H. 789 (which began 22 January 1387) might have been so styled.

It is possible, however, that the Indian system received a further modification to adapt it to the Muhammadan Calendar. Perhaps the Muhammadan year was named after the sign in which Jupiter stood, not at the last preceding time of the Sun's entry into Aries, but at the moment when the Muhammadan year itself began. That would be a possible and perhaps a natural modification, as the Hindu practice took the initial point of the Indian solar year, so the Islamized method may have taken the beginning of the Muhammadan year as the determining point. In that case A. H. 702 would rank as a Cancer year, A. H. 708 would not, and in each of the periods A. H. 720-729 and 729-789 there would be a year which could have been so styled, viz. A. H. 727 and A. H. 788, which began on 27 November 1326 and 2 February 1386, respectively.

All this is very inconclusive, but it seemed worth while to state the elements of the problem, so far as I understand them, in the hope that something may turn up some day which will help us to decide between all these conceivable alternatives. On general grounds, I am inclined to lean towards the latest possible date. But I am free to confess that this feeling, for it is nothing more, is based on our ignorance of the condition of the Malay Peninsula in the 14th century coupled with the relatively late 13th century evidence for the establishment of Islam as a state religion in Northern Sumatra. That, however, is not tantamount to proof, it is merely calculated to raise some degree of presumption; and if anybody prefers to accept one of the possible earlier dates for the Islamization of Trengganu, it appears to me that on the evidence as it stands at present, it cannot be shown that his view is wrong. Whatever the date may have been, I think the record was made at no long interval after it and there is, therefore, no reason to doubt that it gives a true date, if only we could be sure what that date really is.

I append a few notes on words that stand in need of a little explanation.

A 3. *dërma* has one of the meanings, "law", of the Sanskrit *dharma* from which it is derived, *mëraksa* is from the stem of the Sanskrit verb *rakshati*, "to govern", "to guard", "to protect", or from the corresponding noun *raksha*, "guard", with the ordinary Malay prefix. Tha Kota Kapur inscription has *mangraksha* with reference to the gods protecting the realm. A 4. *di-bënua-ku*: it might be possible to read *aku* or *ku* instead of *ku*, but the spelling is against the first and the sense against the second alternative (in place of which one would anyhow rather expect *mu*): *pënëntu* is a very doubtful reading, assumed to be the agent form of *mënëntukan* (in the sense of formulating or possibly establishing and enforcing). Another conceivable reading would be *pëbantu* or *pënbantu*, "those who help or support"; either form would be irregular in spelling, though not much worse than the spelling of Trengganu in A 9. *Raja mandalika* literally means "regional rajas", (from Sanskrit *māṇḍalika*, "relating to a region", *mandalam*). Whether these are local independent rulers as opposed to the Khalifah of All Islam, or territorial chiefs within the State of Trengganu, seems uncertain. But *mandalika* in B 12 refers to territorial chiefs. The Nāgarakrētīgama (1365 A. D.) uses the term to describe the "vassal" states of Majapahit, of which it claims Trengganu as one.

A 6. *bëhumi* is nearer to the Sanskrit *bhūmi* than modern *bumi*. *pënëntua*: the reading and meaning of this or the conceivable alternative *pënbantua* stand or fall with the doubtful *pënëntu* of A 4. The termination *a* for *an* may be due to local dialect (like the spelling of *bujan* for *bujang* in B. 8, C. 1-3). But the Kota Kapur inscription has *kawuatā-nya* as the noun of action of *wuat*, modern *buat*, "to do", where we should now have *përbuatan-nya*.

A 8. *bërbajiki* is doubtful, both in reading and in sense. I have attempted to interpret it on the assumption that a verb with the suffix *i* could (like some modern verbs in *kan*) take both accusative and dative objects without more, as *i* was originally itself a preposition.

A 9. The spelling *Tuhan* was not always reserved for the Deity. It occurs in a Sumatran inscription of 1347 A. D. in the title of a minister of State. *mëdudokkan* may be due to local dialect, or it may be an engraver's error for *mëndudokkan*; *tamra*, which evidently denotes the record itself (and in this particular case could have been rendered "edict") is probably an abbreviation of the Sanskrit *tāmraśāsana*, "an edict, etc., inscribed on copper", which was the usual Indian way, alternatively with stone. I imagine that the long association of the word with royal edicts, grants, etc., coupled with ignorance of its true etymological meaning, led to its abbreviation and to its use to describe this stone record. Trengganu is spelt in this line with a dental (*n*) instead of the velar nasal (*ng*). *adi-përtama* (Sanskrit *ādi* beginning, *prathama*, "first") is a doubtful reading, at any rate as regards the *adi*.

A 10. *sasanakala* (Sanskrit *śāsanam*, "Command, religion", *Kāla*, "time") seems to be a certain reading.

B 7. I take *balachara* to be a compound of Sanskrit *bāla*, "childish, foolish", and *ācāra*, "conduct" (also "rule, ordinance" as in D 5 *achara*).

B 9. The spelling *rautan* (with *alif*) seems to indicate a pronunciation as in *raut*, more archaic than modern *rotan*.

B 10. *atawa* (Sanskrit *utavā*) should perhaps be written *utawa*, and in any case is more archaic than modern *ataw*.

B 11. *hëmbalang* occurs in Javanese in the sense of "pelting, throwing", stones, etc. It is perhaps significant that the record does not use the technical Arabic term, which would probably not have been generally understood at this period.

B 12. Is obscure, there being some doubt as to the reading. It is to be borne in mind that Islamic law requires for the proof of sexual offences of the kind contemplated by the record the evidence of four lawful male eye-witnesses of the act, or alternatively a confession, which the culprit may subsequently retract. Possibly the line means that if the culprit denies an offence which would involve stoning, then he is still to be fined. Such a case might arise if there were not four witnesses as the law requires, but it was morally certain that the offence had in fact been committed. The commutation of a penalty into a money payment seems to be a concession to Indonesian ideas, not strict Muham-madan law. The top stroke of the second *jika* in B 12 has been omitted, making the *k* look like *l*.

C 3. The reading *tëtua* is doubtful; I take the word to be a variant of *tua-tua*, from *tua*, "old", with the sense of *këtua*, "(village) elder."

C 4. *bëndara* (spelt, like *mërdeka*, in a less archaic form than in modern Malay) here has its original sense of "store-house, treasury" (Sanskrit *bhāṇḍāra*, for *bhāṇḍāgāra*). The use of *bëndahara* as a title is due to its having been preceded by *dato* (like our "Lord of the Treasury").

C 6. After *balachara* I think *itu këna dënda* seem probable readings; *tida* (also in D 1, 2, 4) agrees with the *tida* of the Kota Kapur inscription and seems to show that the glottal stop (represented by *k* in modern *tidak*) is a later accretion, as it also is in *dato* (Kota Kapur *dātu*).

D 2. After *tida* I doubtfully conjecture *tëpërbeya*, cf. Javanese *beya*, "expenses, tolls", also a verb meaning to pay such expenses. (It is supposed to come from Sanskrit *vyaya*, "expenditure").

D 3. *pëmain* is a doubtful reading.

A grammatical point worthy of mention is the use of the preposition *di* before words of time (A 10), whereas good modern usage (now, however, not always observed) would confine it to words of place.

I need hardly add, after what has been said above, that I regard the translation I have proposed as being in many respects tentative and provisional.